

REMARKS

5

The Examiner objects to the drawings because a descriptive textual label is considered to be necessary for various elements shown in the figures. Enclosed herewith are corrected drawings responding to the Examiner's objections on informal grounds.

10 The Examiner also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) indicating that certain terminology does not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Accordingly, suitable corrections have been made for the sake of consistency in depicting the various features. No new matter has been entered.

15 Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner pointed out that in different claims a number of instances of claim language are considered vague. Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 have been reviewed in the light of the Examiner's comments concerning indefiniteness, and all of the claims noted have been suitably amended to overcome the rejection.

20 Turning now to the claim rejections on the merits, that is on prior art, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scully et al. (US Patent 4,831,552).

25 The Examiner specifically set forth a basis for the rejection of claim 1 on Scully et al., indicating the elements thought to be present in Scully's prior disclosure under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), thereby anticipating claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4-8 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Scully et al. (US Patent 4,831,552) in view of Jenson (US Patent 5,570,109).

30

In the rejection of claims 2 and 4-8, the Examiner points out what is considered to be disclosed in Scully et al but indicates that "Scully et al does not specifically teach wherein the system displays on the first calendar the data that is stored in the second calendar, if such data is not displayed already on the first calendar." The Examiner then goes on to set forth that it would have been obvious to have combined Jenson with Scully because "Jenson's ability to concurrently allow change to be input, col. 13, lines 25-61, would provide a means of synchronizing the plurality of concurrently displayed electronic calendars in Scully et al's system."

The Examiner further comments specifically with regard to claim 8 concerning the recital of "a third desktop calendar" and a "smart calendar."

With reference to the claims now appearing in this case, the following claims have been cancelled in order to expedite the prosecution of this application; namely, claims 3 and 9-16, without prejudice or disclaimer. Please note that claim 1 has been substantially amended to incorporate the language originally appearing in claim 3 related to including a video camera and a projector in the system.

In the analysis of claim 1 set forth in the Office Action of February 6, 2003, the Examiner ignored the recital of the projector originally appearing in that claim so that quite clearly claim 1 was in no way anticipated by the patent to Scully et al.

With the current amendment in claim 1, both the projector and the video camera are recited.


From the above discussion, it is manifest that claim 1 is clearly allowable to applicant. The further rejection made by the Examiner in Office Action of February 6, 2003 is now moot because given that Scully et al. reference did not anticipate claim 1, the position of the Examiner on the basis of 35 U.S.C. 103 as to obviousness is untenable. The issue can no longer be whether

some teaching found in Jenson could motivate a man skilled in the arts to produce the system as now defined in claims 1-8.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims; i.e., 1-2 and 4-8, herewith presented are clearly allowable to applicant, and the passage to issue of this application is herewith solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

5-2-03


John F. Ohlandt, Reg. No. 19,615
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle
One Landmark Square – 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901